



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/418,418	10/15/1999	KRISHNA A. BHARAT	21708-04479U	8878

22879 7590 10/05/2005

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

TO, BAOQUOC N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/418,418

Applicant(s)

BHARAT ET AL.

Examiner

Baoquoc N. To

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-12 and 14-23 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 07/20/2005 fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that all the searching and ranking taught by Chakrabarti includes or is based on a specific object. Chakrabarti never teaches forming a set of expert documents without reference to a topic. Chakrabarti does not teach ranking expert, but instead ranking a topic based subset of documents. Chakrabarti returned a set of ranked documents based on his argument set that include documents pointing to his root set. Chakrabarti does not teach returning a results list based on the ranked target documents, that would correspond to a portion of, but not all of his augmented list."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument. First of all, the recited claim limitations do not restrict the usage of topic for crawling the web for expert documents. The search query as recited in claim 1 is the query that the user looking for documents as recited limitation 2 indicates, "ranking the expert documents with the query" (this query is the search query to allow the retrieval of documents). Therefore, "the forming a set of expert documents form the set of all hypertext documents crawled without the reference to the search query" is right because the "search query" uses to retrieve documents. Secondly, as discloses by Chakrabarti "a good hub page points to many good authority pages. A good authority is point by many good hub pages (page

Art Unit: 2162

3, lines 13-14). Chakrabarti also discloses the calculation of hub score and authority scores (page 3, lines 19-25), if expert documents are equal to hub pages and target documents are equal to authority pages, then the score of the hub and authorities are used to ranked these documents which meet the requirements of ranking both expert documents and target documents. Finally, the claim only recited "returning a result list based on the ranked target documents" which does not restrict to all the ranked authority documents are returned, in this case Chakrabarti' system only returns all those authority pages which are link-distance two or less from at least one page in the root set (page 3, lines 1-3). Returning part or full documents is not important because it is based on the desired choice. By modification of the conditions for document return based on the search query without departing the scope of the invention.

Applicant also argue "Page does not teach ranking all document crawled without reference to a search topic."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument. The search topic the applicant reference to the search query for retrieving document not the topic for categorizing the documents on the web. Second, the portion of discloses in Chakrabarti disclosing "page views web searches as random walks to assign a topic-independent "rank" to each page on the WWW, which can be used to re-order the output of a search engine" (page 3, lines 12-21). Furthermore, Page also discloses ranking all documents based on the backward or forward links (col. 4, lines 1-67) based on the linked structure (col. 2, lines 52-54). Therefore, Chakrabarti and Page are ranking documents based on the links.

Please see the rejection on 04/21/2005 for all the rejection of claims.

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is at 571-272-4041 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached at 571-272-4107.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2162

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is
assigned are as follow:

(571) -273-8300 [Official Communication]

BQ To

Nov 1st, 2005


JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER